

Extremal solutions for stochastic equations indexed by negative integers and taking values in compact groups

Takao HIRAYAMA⁽¹⁾ and Kouji YANO⁽²⁾⁽³⁾

March 23, 2010

Dedicated to Professor Marc Yor on the occasion of his 60th birthday

Abstract

Stochastic equations indexed by negative integers and taking values in compact groups are studied. Extremal solutions of the equations are characterized in terms of infinite products of independent random variables. This result is applied to characterize several properties of the set of all solutions in terms of the law of the driving noise.

Keywords and phrases: Stochastic equation, Markov process, extremal point, infinite convolution, independent complement.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60J05; secondary 60J50; 60B15.

1 Introduction

Let G be a compact topological group. We consider the following stochastic equation on the state space G indexed by $-\mathbb{N}$:

$$\eta_k = \xi_k \eta_{k-1}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N} \quad (1.1)$$

where $(\eta_k) = (\eta_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ is an unknown process and $(\xi_k) = (\xi_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ is a driving noise, i.e., the ξ_k 's are independent (but in general not identically distributed), both taking values in G . Iterating equation (1.1), we have

$$\eta_k = \xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_{l+1} \eta_l, \quad k, l \in -\mathbb{N}, \quad k > l. \quad (1.2)$$

If we regard η_l as an initial state, then the states afterwards $\{\eta_{l+1}, \eta_{l+2}, \dots, \eta_0\}$ may be obtained from the noise $\{\xi_{l+1}, \xi_{l+2}, \dots, \xi_0\}$ together with the initial state η_l . But the difficulty in the study of equation (1.1) comes from the fact that there is a priori no “initial state at time $-\infty$ ”.

⁽¹⁾ Department of Mathematical Sciences, Ritsumeikan University, Shiga, JAPAN.

⁽²⁾ Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Kobe University, Kobe, JAPAN.

⁽³⁾ The research of this author was supported by KAKENHI (20740060)

We are interested in conditions on the noise law for the set of all possible solutions of equation (1.1) to satisfy certain properties. In particular, we raise the following three questions (all of which will be stated precisely in the next section):

(Q1) Does *uniqueness in law* hold?

(Q2) Does there exist a *strong solution*, i.e., a solution where each η_k is measurable with respect to the noise up to time k ?

(Q3) If a solution is non-strong, the noise process up to time k is inadequate to completely know the value of η_k . Can we find some independent G -valued random variable which complements the lack of information?

The purpose of the present paper is to give clear answers to **(Q1)**-**(Q3)**. Our results generalize those of Yor [20] and complete those of Akahori et al. [1]. We point out that a key role is played by *extremal solutions*, which are precisely the solutions whose remote past is trivial (see Section 2). For this purpose, we shall utilize the general theorems (see Theorems 5.1 and 5.2) about infinite products of independent random variables, which are due to Kloss [12], Tortrat [17] and Csiszár [7]. We will see that, thanks to the choice of $-\mathbb{N}$, instead of $\mathbb{N}$, as the index set, these theorems are deepened by our main theorem (Theorem 2.2) in terms of Markov processes.

The present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some notations, explain our terminology, and then state our main theorems. In Section 3, we give two important lemmas concerning σ -fields. In Section 4, we recall some of the results of Yor [20] and Akahori et al. [1]. Section 5 is devoted to the proofs of main theorems.

2 Main results

2.1 Notations and terminology

Let G be a compact topological group which we assume to be Hausdorff and with a countable basis. Then G is necessarily metrizable (see, e.g., [5, Prop.7.1.12]); in particular, G is a Polish space. To avoid trivial complications, we suppose that G contains more than one element.

Let us give precise definitions as to the terminology appearing in **(Q1)**-**(Q3)**, which is related to some filtration problems. Denote $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. For two processes $(\eta_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ and $(\xi_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ defined on a common probability space, we consider the three filtrations:

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(\eta_m : m \leq k), \quad \mathcal{F}_k^\xi = \sigma(\xi_m : m \leq k), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_k^{\eta, \xi} = \sigma(\eta_m, \xi_m : m \leq k). \quad (2.1)$$

Let $\mu = (\mu_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ be a family of probability laws μ_k on G . By a *solution of equation (1.1) (with the noise law μ)*, we mean a pair of processes $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ defined on

a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ such that

$$\text{for any } k \in -\mathbb{N}, \quad \begin{cases} \eta_k = \xi_k \eta_{k-1} & \text{a.s.}, \\ \xi_k \text{ is independent of } \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^\eta, \\ \xi_k \text{ has law } \mu_k. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

This is equivalent to stating that (η_k) is a (possibly time-inhomogeneous) Markov process indexed by $-\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$E[f(\eta_k) | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}^\eta] = \int_G f(g\eta_{k-1}) \mu_k(dg) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N} \quad (2.3)$$

for all non-negative Borel function f on G . We note that, since

$$\xi_k = \eta_k(\eta_{k-1})^{-1} \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (2.4)$$

there is the equality $\mathcal{F}_k^{\eta, \xi} = \mathcal{F}_k^\eta$; in particular, $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi \subset \mathcal{F}_k^\eta$.

Let us fix $\mu = (\mu_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ throughout this paper. Following Yor [20] and Akahori et al. [1], we introduce the following definitions:

- Let $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ denote the set of the laws of (η_k) on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$ for all possible solutions $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$. The set $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is a compact convex subset of $\mathcal{P}(G^{-\mathbb{N}})$, the set of all probability laws on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$, equipped with the topology of weak convergence and with the usual convex structure.
- We say that a solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is *extremal* if the law of (η_k^0) is an extremal point of the compact convex set $\mathcal{P}_\mu$. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{extremal}}$ the set of all extremal points of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$.
- We say that *uniqueness in law* holds if any two solutions have the same laws.
- We say that a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ is *strong* if each η_k is a.s. measurable with respect to the past noise, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta \subset \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$; so that in this case $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{strong}}$ the set of the laws of (η_k) for all strong solutions $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$.

The terms “uniqueness in law” and “strong” originate from the theory of stochastic differential equations; see, e.g., [10].

2.2 Basic facts

Let us recall some basic facts concerning solutions of equation (1.1).

First, we state without proof the following five facts numbered from **1)** to **5)**, which are due to Yor [20] and Akahori et al. [1]. We will give their proofs in Section 4 for completeness of this paper.

1). For a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$, the joint law of $((\eta_k), (\xi_k))$ on $G^{-\mathbb{N}} \times G^{-\mathbb{N}}$ is determined from the sequence (λ_k) of the marginal laws of (η_k) on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$. We can and do in what follows identify two solutions having common joint laws, so that a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ will be identified with the sequence (λ_k) as well as with the law of (η_k) on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$, which is a point of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$.

2). For a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$, the sequence (λ_k) of the marginal laws of (η_k) satisfies the convolution equation

$$\lambda_k = \mu_k * \lambda_{k-1}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (2.5)$$

Conversely, for a sequence $(\lambda_k) \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ satisfying the convolution equation (2.5), there exists a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ whose joint law is unique such that (λ_k) is the marginal laws of (η_k) , i.e., $\lambda_k = P(\eta_k \in \cdot)$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$.

3). Whatever the noise law $\mu = (\mu_k)$ is, there always exists a solution $\{(\eta_k^*), (\xi_k)\}$ such that each η_k^* is uniform on G , i.e., the law of η_k^* on G is the *normalized Haar measure* of G . This is the case because G is compact. We call $\{(\eta_k^*), (\xi_k)\}$ the *uniform solution* and we denote the law of (η_k^*) by P_μ^* . From this, we obtain the following:

- Uniqueness in law holds if and only if $\mathcal{P}_\mu = \{P_\mu^*\}$.
- Since $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is non-empty, so is $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{extremal}}$.

Moreover, the uniform solution is non-strong; in fact, each η_k^* is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$.

4). A solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is extremal if and only if the remote past $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{\eta^0} := \cap_k \mathcal{F}_k^{\eta^0}$ is trivial. By Kolmogorov's 0-1 law, we see that a strong solution is always extremal; in other words,

$$\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{strong}} \subset \mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{extremal}} \subset \mathcal{P}_\mu. \quad (2.6)$$

5). Let an extremal solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ be fixed. Any other extremal solution is then identical in law to $\{(\eta_k^0 g), (\xi_k)\}$ for some $g \in G$. This shows that any solution is identical in law to $\{(\eta_k^0 V), (\xi_k)\}$ for some G -valued random variable V independent of $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$.

Second, we mention the following trichotomy, which may be deduced immediately from the above facts 1)-5) (see also [19]):

Case (A): Uniqueness in law holds, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_\mu = \{P_\mu^*\}$. In this case, the uniform solution is the only solution, so it is extremal, but it is non-strong.

Case (B): There exists a strong solution, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{strong}} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, uniqueness in law fails. Moreover, it holds that $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{extremal}}$, i.e., all extremal solutions are strong, and all non-extremal ones are not.

Case (C): Uniqueness in law fails and there is no strong solution. In this case, it holds that $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\text{extremal}} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_\mu$.

Third, we discuss some problem of filtrations. The discussion in the following seems elementary but needs more carefulness than one may expect; see, e.g., [3, §2.5] and references therein. In fact, it has been a source of errors; see, e.g., [19, a) of §5].

For decreasing σ -fields $\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_{-1}, \dots$ and a σ -field $\mathcal{G}$, it is obvious that

$$\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}) \supset \left(\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_l \right) \vee \mathcal{G}. \quad (2.7)$$

But this inclusion is sometimes strict; one cannot always change the order of the two operations $\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}}$ and $\vee$. We will give in Lemma 3.3 some sufficient condition so that the equality holds in (2.7). For some recent discussions of this well-studied question, see Crimaldi et al. [6] and Berti et al. [2].

Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be a solution. By equation (1.1), we have

$$\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi) = \mathcal{F}_0^\eta \quad (2.8)$$

whereas

$$\left(\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_l^\eta \right) \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi = \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi. \quad (2.9)$$

As we have noted above, the σ -field (2.9) may be strictly contained in (2.8); in other words, the present $\mathcal{F}_0^\eta$ may possess some extra information which cannot be explained by the noise $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ together with $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$, the “initial state at $-\infty$ ”. So we want to find a sub σ -field $\mathcal{G}$ such that

$$\mathcal{F}_0^\eta = \mathcal{G} \vee \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi \text{ a.s.} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\text{and the three } \sigma\text{-fields } \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \text{ and } \mathcal{F}_0^\xi \text{ are independent.} \quad (2.11)$$

We call $\mathcal{G}$ an *independent complement* of $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ in $\mathcal{F}_0^\eta$. See Chaumont–Yor [3, §2] and references therein.

2.3 Extremal solution

Let us present our main theorems. The proofs of all theorems and corollaries presented in this subsection will be given in Section 5.

For a compact subgroup H of G , we denote by ω_H the normalized Haar measure on H . We denote by G/H the quotient set, i.e., the set of all left cosets $gH = \{gh : h \in H\}$ for $g \in G$. The set G/H is equipped with the smallest topology in which the canonical projection $G \ni g \mapsto gH \in G/H$ is continuous. Then we see that G/H is compact and metrizable.

The following theorem, which is essentially due to Csiszár [7], concerns infinite convolution products of probability laws on G .

Theorem 2.1. *There exist a sequence (λ_k) of probability laws on G , a sequence (α_i) of deterministic elements of G , and a compact subgroup H of G , such that the following*

statements hold:

(I1) $\mu_k * \mu_{k-1} * \cdots * \mu_l * \delta_{\alpha_l} \rightarrow \lambda_k$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;

(I2) $\delta_{\alpha_l^{-1}} * \lambda_{l-1} \rightarrow \omega_H$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$;

(I3) $\lambda_k * \delta_h = \lambda_k$ for each $h \in H$ and each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;

(I4) If ξ_k 's are independent random variables such that each ξ_k has law μ_k ,

then, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l H$ converges a.s. in G/H as $l \rightarrow -\infty$.

If, moreover, $(\tilde{\lambda}_k)$, $(\tilde{\alpha}_k)$ and $\tilde{H}$ also satisfy (I1)-(I4), then it holds that

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k = \lambda_k * \delta_g, \quad \tilde{H} = g^{-1} H g \quad (2.12)$$

for all accumulation point g of $\{\alpha_l^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_l : l \in -\mathbb{N}\}$.

We remark that the sequence (λ_k) above satisfies the convolution equation (2.5). This suggests that it is natural to choose $-\mathbb{N}$, instead of $\mathbb{N}$, as the index set. We may say that the following theorem, which characterizes extremal solutions, deepens Theorem 2.1 in terms of Markov processes.

Theorem 2.2. *For any extremal solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$, there exist a sequence (α_l) of deterministic elements of G and a compact subgroup H of G such that the following four conditions hold:*

(E1) $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l \xrightarrow{d} \eta_k^0$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;

(E2) $\alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}^0 \xrightarrow{d} U_H$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ where U_H is uniform on H ;

(E3) $(\eta_k^0 h) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0)$ for each $h \in H$ and each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;

(E4) $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l H \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta_k^0 H$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$.

If, moreover, $\{(\tilde{\eta}_k^0), (\tilde{\xi}_k)\}$ is another extremal solution which satisfies (E1)-(E4) with $(\tilde{\alpha}_l)$ and $\tilde{H}$, then it holds that

$$(\tilde{\eta}_k^0) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0 g), \quad \tilde{H} = g^{-1} H g \quad (2.13)$$

for all accumulation point g of $\{\alpha_l^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_l : l \in -\mathbb{N}\}$.

Remark 2.3. Since η_{k-1}^0 is independent of $\sigma(\xi_k, \xi_{k-1}, \dots, \xi_l)$, we can combine the two conditions (E1) and (E2) together as follows:

• $(\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l, \alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}^0) \xrightarrow{d} (\eta_k^0, U_H)$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$

where U_H is independent of η_k^0 and is uniform on H .

In particular, this shows $\eta_k^0 U_H \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_k^0$, which immediately implies (E3).

The following theorem plays an essential role in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Theorem 2.4. *The following statements hold:*

(i) If $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is a solution and satisfies (E1) with some (α_l) , then it is extremal.

(ii) If $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is a solution which satisfies (E1), (E3) and (E4) for some (α_l) and some H , then it also satisfies (E2) with these (α_l) and H .

For a given noise law $\mu = (\mu_k)$, the compact subgroup H of Theorem 2.1 (or Theorem 2.2) is unique up to conjugacy, so we sometimes denote it by H_μ . The subgroup H_μ may be characterized as follows.

Corollary 2.5. *Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$, (α_l) and H_μ be as in Theorem 2.2. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) $H_\mu = \left\{ h \in G : (\eta_k^0 h) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0) \right\};$
- (ii) H_μ is the smallest compact subgroup H such that $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l H \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta_k^0 H$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$.

The following corollary answers (Q1) and (Q2).

Corollary 2.6. *Let H_μ be as in Theorem 2.1. Then the following statements hold:*

- (A) *The following statements are equivalent:*
 - (A1) *Uniqueness in law holds;*
 - (A2) $H_\mu = G$;
 - (A3) *For any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \xrightarrow{d} U_G$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ where U_G is uniform on G .*
 - (B) *The following statements are equivalent:*
 - (B1) *There exists a strong solution;*
 - (B2) $H_\mu = \{\text{unit}\}$;
 - (B3) *There exists a sequence (α_l) of deterministic elements of G such that, for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, $\xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l$ converges a.s. as $l \rightarrow -\infty$.*
- In this case, if we write η_k^0 for the limit in (B3), then the pair $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is a strong (and consequently extremal) solution.*

2.4 Complementation formulae

For any compact subgroup H of G , there always exists a measurable section $\mathbf{s}(\cdot) : G/H \rightarrow G$ (see [5, Exercise 8.4]). We define the measurable mapping $\mathbf{h}(\cdot) : G \rightarrow H$ as

$$\mathbf{h}(g) = (\mathbf{s}(gH))^{-1}g, \quad g \in G. \quad (2.14)$$

Then the mapping

$$G \ni g = \mathbf{s}(gH)\mathbf{h}(g) \mapsto (gH, \mathbf{h}(g)) \in (G/H) \times H \quad (2.15)$$

is a bi-measurable bijection, where the direct product $(G/H) \times H$ is equipped with product topology.

In this subsection, we assume that $\mu = (\mu_k)$ denotes a given noise law and that (λ_k) , (α_l) and H are as in Theorem 2.1. Let $\mathbf{s}(\cdot) : G/H \rightarrow G$ be a measurable section associated with this H and $\mathbf{h}(\cdot)$ be as defined by (2.14).

The following theorem provides us with a procedure of constructing an extremal solution from the noise together with an additional randomness.

Theorem 2.7. *Let ξ_k 's be independent random variables such that each ξ_k has law μ_k and let U_0 be a G -valued random variable independent of (ξ_k) . For each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, define*

$$\phi_k = \mathbf{s} \left(\lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l H \right), \quad (2.16)$$

$$U_k = \phi_k^{-1} (\xi_0 \xi_{-1} \cdots \xi_{k+1})^{-1} \phi_0 U_0, \quad (2.17)$$

and then define

$$\eta_k^0 = \phi_k U_k. \quad (2.18)$$

Then $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is an extremal solution such that each η_k^0 has law λ_k . Moreover, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, it holds that U_k is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ and is uniform on H , and that

$$\mathcal{F}_k^{\eta^0} = \sigma(U_k) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad (2.19)$$

where $\sigma(U_k)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent.

Theorem 2.7 will be proved in Subsection 5.3.

By Theorem 2.7 and by point 4) of Subsection 2.1, any solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ may be represented as $\eta_k = \phi_k U_k V$ for some random variable V independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi \vee \sigma(U_0)$, and consequently, it holds that, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta \subset \sigma(U_k) \vee \sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.20)$$

For the converse inclusion, we need to take V nicely and to represent V and U_k in terms of (η_k) . The following theorem solves this problem and answers (Q3) completely.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be any solution. For any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, define*

$$\phi_k = \mathbf{s} \left(\lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l \alpha_l H \right), \quad (2.21)$$

$$V = \mathbf{s} \left(\lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \eta_l^{-1} \phi_l H \right)^{-1}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$U_k = \mathbf{h}(\eta_k V^{-1}). \quad (2.23)$$

Then, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, the random variable η_k is factorized as $\eta_k = \phi_k U_k V$ and the following statements hold:

- (i) $\phi_k \in \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s.;
- (ii) U_k is independent of $\sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ and is uniform on H ;
- (iii) $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta = \sigma(V)$.

Moreover, it holds that, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(U_k) \vee \sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.24)$$

where the three σ -fields $\sigma(U_k)$, $\sigma(V)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent.

Theorem 2.8 will be proved in Subsection 5.6.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be any solution. Then the identity*

$$\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi) = \left(\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_l^\eta \right) \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (2.25)$$

holds if and only if there exists a strong solution.

Proof. By (2.8) and (2.9), the identity (2.25) holds if and only if $\mathcal{F}_0^\eta = \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$. By Theorem 2.8, this is equivalent to triviality of $\sigma(U_0)$, which leads to $H = \{\text{unit}\}$. The proof is now completed by (B) of Corollary 2.6. $\square$

2.5 The case of one-dimensional torus

Let us consider the case of one-dimensional torus $G = \mathbb{T} \cong [0, 1)$. In this case we prefer addition instead of multiplication, so that equation (1.1) may be rewritten as

$$\eta_k = \xi_k + \eta_{k-1}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (2.26)$$

For a given noise law $\mu = (\mu_k)$, the compact subgroup $H = H_\mu$ as in Theorem 2.1 is uniquely determined. We have the following three distinct cases:

- (A) $H_\mu = [0, 1)$.
- (B) $H_\mu = \{0\}$.
- (C) H_μ may be expressed as

$$H_\mu = \left\{ 0, \frac{1}{p_\mu}, \dots, \frac{p_\mu - 1}{p_\mu} \right\} \quad (2.27)$$

for some integer $p_\mu \geq 2$.

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $[x]$ for the integer part of x , i.e., the largest integer which does not exceed x , and write $\{x\}$ for the fractional part of x , i.e., $\{x\} = x - [x]$. In the case (C), we identify the quotient set G/H_μ with $[0, 1/p_\mu)$ ($\cong \mathbb{T}$). In this case, we may choose as the measurable section $\mathbf{s}(\cdot)$ the mapping

$$\mathbf{s}_\mu(x + H_\mu) = \{p_\mu x\}/p_\mu, \quad x \in [0, 1), \quad (2.28)$$

hence we see that $\mathbf{h}(\cdot) = \mathbf{h}_\mu(\cdot)$ is given as

$$\mathbf{h}_\mu(x) = [p_\mu x]/p_\mu, \quad x \in [0, 1). \quad (2.29)$$

Now we obtain the following corollary (see Subsection 4.1):

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose that $G = \mathbb{T} \cong [0, 1)$. Let (α_l) and H_μ as in Theorem 2.2. Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be any solution. Then the following statements hold:*

(A) Uniqueness in law holds if and only if $H_\mu = [0, 1)$. In this case, it holds that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is trivial and, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that η_k is uniform on G and

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(\eta_k) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (2.30)$$

where $\sigma(\eta_k)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent;

(B) There exists a strong solution if and only if $H_\mu = \{0\}$. In this case, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, the limits

$$\phi_k := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \left(\sum_{j=l}^k \xi_j + \alpha_l \right), \quad V := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} (\eta_l - \phi_l) \quad a.s., \quad (2.31)$$

exist and $\eta_k = \phi_k + V$ where V is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$. Moreover, it holds that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta = \sigma(V)$ a.s. and, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (2.32)$$

where $\sigma(V)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent;

(C) Suppose that H_μ is of the form (2.27) for $p_\mu \geq 2$. Then, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, the limits

$$\phi_k := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \left(\sum_{j=l}^k \xi_j + \alpha_l \right) \text{ modulo } \frac{1}{p_\mu} \quad a.s., \quad (2.33)$$

$$V := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} (\eta_l - \phi_l) \text{ modulo } \frac{1}{p_\mu} \quad a.s. \quad (2.34)$$

exist where V is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$;

$$U_k := \frac{1}{p_\mu} [p_\mu (\eta_k - V)] \quad (2.35)$$

is uniform on H_μ and is independent of $\sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$. Moreover, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, it holds that $\eta_k = \phi_k + U_k + V$ and that

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(U_k) \vee \sigma(V) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (2.36)$$

where the three σ -fields $\sigma(U_k)$, $\sigma(V)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent.

3 Some discussion on σ -fields

In this section we give two lemmas concerning σ -fields, which will play important roles in our analysis. These lemmas seem elementary but should be dealt with carefully, because their statements are sources of errors. The first one is as follows.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space. Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be two sub σ -fields. Let X be an integrable random variable. Suppose that $\sigma(X) \vee \mathcal{F}_0$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}$. Then it holds that*

$$E[X | \mathcal{F}_0 \vee \mathcal{G}] = E[X | \mathcal{F}_0]. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Since $\sigma(X) \vee \mathcal{F}_0$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}$, we have, for $A \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $B \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$E[X1_A1_B] = E[X1_A]E[1_B] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}]1_A]E[1_B] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}]1_A1_B]. \quad (3.2)$$

Thus, a monotone class argument yields

$$E[X1_C] = E[E[X|\mathcal{F}_0]1_C], \quad C \in \mathcal{F}_0 \vee \mathcal{G}. \quad (3.3)$$

Now the proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 3.2. If we assume, instead of the independence between $\sigma(X) \vee \mathcal{F}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}$, that $\mathcal{F}_0$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are independent, then the conclusion (3.1) does not hold; see [3, Exercise 2.2.1] for counterexamples.

The second one is taken from [3, Exercise 2.5.1].

Lemma 3.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space. Let $\{\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_{-1}, \dots\}$ be a decreasing sequence of sub σ -fields and $\mathcal{G}$ a sub σ -field. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_0$ is independent of $\mathcal{G}$. Then it holds that*

$$\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}) = \left(\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_l \right) \vee \mathcal{G}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. Let us write $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}$ for $\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_l$. It suffices to prove that $\bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{-\infty} \vee \mathcal{G}$, since the opposite inclusion is obvious. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}_0$ and $B \in \mathcal{G}$. Then, on one hand, we have

$$E[1_A1_B|\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}] \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow -\infty} E \left[1_A1_B \middle| \bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}) \right]. \quad (3.5)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$E[1_A1_B|\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}] = E[1_A|\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}]1_B = E[1_A|\mathcal{F}_l]1_B \quad (\text{from Lemma 3.1}) \quad (3.6)$$

$$\xrightarrow{l \rightarrow -\infty} E[1_A|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}]1_B = E[1_A|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty} \vee \mathcal{G}]1_B = E[1_A1_B|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty} \vee \mathcal{G}]. \quad (3.7)$$

Hence we see that the identity

$$E \left[X \middle| \bigcap_{l \in -\mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{F}_l \vee \mathcal{G}) \right] = E[X|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty} \vee \mathcal{G}] \quad (3.8)$$

holds for $X = 1_{A \cap B}$. A monotone class argument shows that the identity (3.8) holds for all $X \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_0 \vee \mathcal{G})$. Now the proof is complete. $\square$

4 Stochastic equations indexed by negative integers

Our problem originates from Tsirelson's example of a stochastic differential equation with driving Brownian motion which has no strong solution ([4]). He reduced the problem to equation (1.1) on the torus $G = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ where the noise process consists of the projections of independent Gaussian variables. See [18] and [19] for brief surveys of this topic; see also [16]. (Note that, in [18] and [16], the authors used the word “remote past” for “something at the time $-\infty$ ”, which is misleading because it is different from the usual terminology where “remote past” means the σ -field $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$.)

4.1 Yor's stochastic equation

Looking for some better understanding of the properties of Tsirelson's equation [4], Yor [20] studied the equation on the state space $\mathbb{R}$ given as

$$\eta_k = \xi_k + \{\eta_{k-1}\}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N} \quad (4.1)$$

for a general noise process ξ , where $\{x\}$ stands for the fractional part of x . He characterized the properties of the set of solutions in terms of the noise laws. Let us recall some of his results.

Let $\mu = (\mu_k : k \in -\mathbb{N})$ be a family of probability laws on $\mathbb{R}$. Define

$$\mathbb{Z}_\mu = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{Z} : \pi_\mu(p) := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \prod_{k:k \leq l} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i p x} \mu_k(dx) \right| > 0 \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Note that $\pi_\mu(p) = 1$ if $p \in \mathbb{Z}_\mu$, while $\pi_\mu(p) = 0$ otherwise. Then it follows (see [20, Prop.3]) that $\mathbb{Z}_\mu$ is a subgroup of the additive group $\mathbb{Z}$. Now there exists a unique non-negative integer p_μ such that $\mathbb{Z}_\mu = p_\mu \mathbb{Z}$. The following theorem, which summarizes Prop.4, Thm.3, Thm.4 and Thm.5 of [20], gives a complete answer to **(Q1)-(Q3)**:

Theorem 4.1 ([20]). *Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ denote any solution of (4.1). Then the following statements hold:*

(A) *Uniqueness in law holds if and only if $p_\mu = 0$. In this case, it holds that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is trivial and, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that the fractional part $\{\eta_k\}$ is uniform on $[0, 1)$, and that*

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma(\{\eta_k\}) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (4.3)$$

where $\sigma(\{\eta_k\})$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent;

(B) *There exists a strong solution if and only if $p_\mu = 1$. In this case, it holds, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that*

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (4.4)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent;

(C) *If $p_\mu = 2, 3, \dots$, then it holds, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that*

$$\{p_\mu \eta_k\} \in \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s., \quad [p_\mu \eta_k] \text{ is uniform on } \{0, 1, \dots, p_\mu - 1\}, \quad (4.5)$$

where $[x]$ stands for the integer part of x , and that

$$\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \sigma([p_\mu \eta_k]) \vee \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad a.s. \quad (4.6)$$

where the three σ -fields $\sigma([p_\mu \eta_k])$, $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent.

Note that if $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ is a solution of equation (4.1) taking values in $\mathbb{R}$, then the pair $\{(\{\eta_k\}), (\{\xi_k\})\}$ is a solution of equation (1.1) taking values in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, it has been proved in [1, §9] that certain properties, which are of interest to us, of the solutions of equation (4.1) are equivalent to those of the solutions of equation (1.1). Here $\mathbb{Z}_\mu = p_\mu \mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to our H_μ in relation (2.27).

Remark 4.2. (i) Identity (4.2) shows how to compute the characteristic p_μ from the noise law μ . We can characterize the subgroup H_μ in terms of the noise law μ completely in the case where G is commutative, but we do not know how to do this in the general case; see [1, Thm.6.1].

(ii) Our Corollary 2.10 gives more information than Yor's Theorem 4.1 in that the remote past $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is given explicitly as $\sigma(V)$ in the cases (B) and (C).

4.2 General lemmas

Let us give several general lemmas concerning solutions of equation (1.1) taking values in compact groups.

Lemma 4.3 ([1, Lem.4.3]). *The following assertions hold:*

- (i) *Let $\{(\eta_k^1), (\xi_k^1)\}$ and $\{(\eta_k^2), (\xi_k^2)\}$ be two solutions of (1.1). Suppose that $\eta_l^1 \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_l^2$ for all $l \in -\mathbb{N}$. Then $(\eta_k^1) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^2)$.*
- (ii) *Let $(\lambda_k) \subset \mathcal{P}(G)$ which satisfies the convolution equation:*

$$\lambda_k = \mu_k * \lambda_{k-1}, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (4.7)$$

Then there exists a solution $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ such that each η_k has law λ_k .

Proof. (i) Let $l \in -\mathbb{N}$. For any $k \geq l$, we have $\eta_k^i = \xi_k^i \cdots \xi_{l+1}^i \eta_l^i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence we see that the joint laws of $(\eta_l^i, \eta_{l+1}^i, \dots, \eta_0^i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ coincide. This proves that $(\eta_k^1) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^2)$.

(ii) For any $l \in -\mathbb{N}$, we construct a family of random variables $\{\eta_k^{(l)}, \xi_k^{(l)} : k = l, \dots, 0\}$ as follows: Let $X, \xi_l, \dots, \xi_0$ be independent random variables such that X has law λ_{l-1} and each ξ_k has law μ_k . For $k = l, \dots, 0$, we define $\eta_k^{(l)} = \xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l X$. Then from the convolution equation (4.7), it follows easily that the family $\{\Pi^{(l)} : l \in -\mathbb{N}\}$ of probability laws $\Pi^{(l)}$ of $\{\eta_k^{(l)}, \xi_k^{(l)} : k = l, \dots, 0\}$ is consistent. Thus, by Kolmogorov's extension theorem, we see that there exists a pair of processes $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ such that, for each $l \in -\mathbb{N}$, the law of $\{\eta_k, \xi_k : k = l, \dots, 0\}$ is $\Pi^{(l)}$. It is now easy to verify that the process $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ is as desired. $\square$

Theorem 4.4 ([20],[1]). *There exists a unique uniform solution, i.e., a solution $\{(\eta_k^*), (\xi_k)\}$ such that each η_k^* is uniform on G . Moreover, each η_k^* is independent of (ξ_k) .*

Proof. Let $\lambda_k = \omega_G$ for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. Then the sequence (λ_k) satisfies the convolution equation (4.7), and hence we obtain the desired conclusion by Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Remark 4.5. A process (η_k) is called *stationary* if, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the joint law of $(\eta_k, \eta_{k-1}, \dots, \eta_{k-n})$ does not depend on $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. Since $\xi_k = \eta_k^*(\eta_{k-1}^*)^{-1}$, we see that, if the process (η_k^*) is stationary, then the noise (ξ_k) is identically distributed. In this case, the process (η_k^*) is stationary. See [16] for the detailed discussion in this case.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be a solution. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *For all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. (i.e., this solution is strong);*
- (ii) *There exists $k \in -\mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s.;*
- (iii) *$\mathcal{F}_0^\eta = \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ a.s.*

Proof. It is obvious that (i) implies (iii) and that (iii) implies (ii). Let us prove that (ii) implies (i).

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\eta = \mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\xi$ a.s. for some $k_0 \in -\mathbb{N}$. For $k \geq k_0 + 1$, since $\eta_k = \xi_k \cdots \xi_{k_0+1} \eta_{k_0}$ and since $\eta_{k_0} \in \mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\xi \subset \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s., we have $\eta_k \in \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$. For $k \leq k_0 - 1$, since $\eta_k = (\xi_{k_0} \cdots \xi_{k+1})^{-1} \eta_{k_0}$, we have $\eta_k \in \mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\xi$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\xi = \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \vee \mathcal{G}$ with $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_{k_0})$ which is assumed independent of $\sigma(\eta_k) \vee \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$, Lemma 3.1 shows that $1_A(\eta_k) = E[1_A(\eta_k) | \mathcal{F}_{k_0}^\xi] = E[1_A(\eta_k) | \mathcal{F}_k^\xi]$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}(G)$. This proves that $\eta_k \in \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. Thus we obtain $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta \subset \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. By identity (2.4), we obtain $\mathcal{F}_k^\eta = \mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ a.s. for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. The proof is now complete. $\square$

Recall that $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is the set of the laws of (η_k) on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$ for all possible solutions of equation (1.1). Thus $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is a subset of the compact convex set $\mathcal{P}(G^{-\mathbb{N}})$ where $\mathcal{P}(G^{-\mathbb{N}})$ is equipped with the topology of weak convergence. Moreover, by Markov property (2.3), we see that $\mathcal{P}_\mu$ is also compact and convex.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be a solution. Then it is extremal, i.e., the law of (η_k) is an extremal point of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$, if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is trivial.*

The proof can be found in [20, Thm.1] and [1, Lem.1.2], but we give it for completeness of this paper.

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that (η_k) is the coordinate process on $G^{-\mathbb{N}}$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is trivial. Suppose also that P can be represented as $P = cP_1 + (1 - c)P_2$ for some $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_\mu$ and $0 < c < 1$. Then P_1 is absolutely continuous with respect to P . By the Radon–Nikodym theorem, we see that there exists a non-negative functional D such that $dP_1 = DdP$. Let Z be a non-negative functional. Since P and

P_1 are solutions with the same noise, we have $P[Z|\mathcal{F}_k^\eta] = P_1[Z|\mathcal{F}_k^\eta]$ P -a.s. by Markov property (2.3). Hence we have

$$P[DPZ] = P_1[Z] = P_1[P_1[Z|\mathcal{F}_k^\eta]] = P[DP[Z|\mathcal{F}_k^\eta]] = P[P[D|\mathcal{F}_k^\eta]Z]. \quad (4.8)$$

This shows that $D \in \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ P -a.s. Since $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is P -trivial, we have $D = 1$ and $P_1 = P$. This proves that P is an extremal point of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ is not trivial. Then there exists a set $A \in \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$ such that $c := P(A) \in (0, 1)$. Hence P may be represented as $P = cP_1 + (1 - c)P_2$ where $dP_1 = 1_A dP/c$ and $dP_2 = 1_{A^c} dP/(1 - c)$. It is easy to see that $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_\mu$, which shows that P is not an extremal point of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$. $\square$

4.3 Results from Akahori–Uenishi–Yano [1]

Let us recall several results from Akahori et al. [1].

Theorem 4.8 ([1]). *Let $\{(\eta_k^1), (\xi_k^1)\}$ and $\{(\eta_k^2), (\xi_k^2)\}$ be two solutions of (1.1). Suppose that they are extremal. Then there exists a deterministic element $g \in G$ such that $\{(\eta_k^2), (\xi_k^2)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{(\eta_k^1 g), (\xi_k^1)\}$.*

The proof of Theorem 4.8 can be found in [1, Thm.1.3], which was based on a coupling method. So we omit the proof.

Corollary 4.9. *Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ be an extremal solution. Then any solution $\{(\eta_k^1), (\xi_k^1)\}$ may be represented as*

$$\{(\eta_k^1), (\xi_k^1)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{(\eta_k^0 V), (\xi_k)\} \quad (4.9)$$

for some G -valued random variable V independent of $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$.

Proof. From Theorem 4.8, it follows that the laws $P^{(\eta_k^0 g)}$ of $(\eta_k^0 g)$ for $g \in G$ exhaust all extremal points of $\mathcal{P}_\mu$. By the Krein–Milman theorem (see, e.g., [15]), we see that the law $P^{(\eta_k^1)}$ of (η_k^1) may be represented as

$$P^{(\eta_k^1)}(\cdot) = \int_G P^{(\eta_k^0 g)}(\cdot) \nu(dg) \quad (4.10)$$

for some probability law ν on G . Then we have $(\eta_k^1) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0 V)$ for some G -valued random variable V independent of (η_k^0) . By equation (2.4), we complete the proof. $\square$

Akahori et al. [1] partially generalized Yor’s Theorem 4.1. To summarize in the framework of groups, we may say that Yor’s study [20] was based on the *Pontryagin duality* between the (locally) compact group $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and the class of all characters on $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, while Akahori et al. [1] was based on the *Tannaka duality* between a compact group G and the class of all unitary representations on G .

Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ be an extremal solution. Define

$$H_\mu^{\text{iso}} = \{g \in G : (\eta_k^0 g) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0)\}. \quad (4.11)$$

Let $\mathfrak{G}$ denote the set of all unitary representations ρ of G on a finite dimensional linear space. Define

$$\mathfrak{H}_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \left\{ \rho \in \mathfrak{G} : \rho(\eta_k^0) \in \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \text{ a.s. for all } k \in -\mathbb{N} \right\} \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$H_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \{g \in G : \rho(g) = \text{id for every } \rho \in \mathfrak{H}_\mu^{\text{strong}}\}. \quad (4.13)$$

Theorem 4.10 ([1, Thm.1.6]). *The following statements hold:*

- (A) *Uniqueness in law holds if and only if $H_\mu^{\text{iso}} = G$;*
- (B) *There exists a strong solution if and only if $H_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \{\text{unit}\}$.*

By virtue of our Theorem 2.2, we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 4.11. *Let H_μ and $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ as in Theorem 2.2. Let H_μ^{iso} and H_μ^{strong} be associated with $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$. Then it holds that*

$$H_\mu^{\text{iso}} = H_\mu, \quad H_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \bigcup_{g \in G} g H_\mu g^{-1}. \quad (4.14)$$

In other words, H_μ^{strong} is the smallest normal subgroup containing H_μ .

The proof of Theorem 4.11 will be given in Subsection 5.7.

5 Proofs of main theorems

We prove our main theorems in the following order: Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.4, Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.2, and Theorem 2.8.

5.1 General principle of Kloss–Tortrat–Csiszár

Limit laws of infinite products of random variables on compact groups have been first studied by Kawada–Itô [11]. After that, Kloss [12] discovered a general principle of infinite products, which was generalized to locally compact groups by Tortrat [17] and by Csiszár [7] independently. Let us recall some results from Csiszár [7]. For some discussions in the case of locally compact semigroups, see, e.g., Mukherjea–Tserpes [13]. For basic notations and facts about probability laws on compact groups, see, e.g., standard textbooks [14], [9] and [8].

The following theorems are taken from Csiszár [7], where he called them *Kloss’s general principle*:

Theorem 5.1 ([7, Thm.3.1]). *Let $(\xi_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of independent G -valued random variables. Then there exists a sequence $(\alpha_m : m \in \mathbb{N})$ of deterministic elements of G such that, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the product $\xi_n \xi_{n+1} \cdots \xi_m \alpha_m$ converge in law as $m \rightarrow \infty$.*

Theorem 5.2 ([7, Thm.3.2]). *Let $(\xi_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ be a sequence of independent G -valued random variables. Assume that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the product $\xi_n \xi_{n+1} \cdots \xi_m$ converges in law as $m \rightarrow \infty$ to some G -valued random variable η_n . Then there exists a unique compact subgroup H of G such that the following statements hold:*

- (i) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h \in H$, $\eta_n h \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_n$;*
 - (ii) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_n \xi_{n+1} \cdots \xi_m H$ converges a.s. in G/H as $m \rightarrow \infty$.*
- In this case, it holds that*
- (iii) *$\eta_n \xrightarrow{d} \omega_H$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

5.2 Infinite products of independent random variables

For any probability laws (μ_k) on G and any $k, l \in -\mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq l$, we write $\mu_{k,l} := \mu_k * \mu_{k-1} * \cdots * \mu_l$; for instance, $\mu_{k,k} = \mu_k$, $\mu_{k,k-1} = \mu_k * \mu_{k-1}$, and so on. For any G -valued random variables (ξ_k) and any $k, l \in -\mathbb{N}$ with $k \geq l$, we write $\xi_{k,l} = \xi_k \xi_{k-1} \cdots \xi_l$; for instance, $\xi_{k,k} = \xi_k$, $\xi_{k,k-1} = \xi_k \xi_{k-1}$, and so on.

Let us prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. By Theorem 5.1, there exist a sequence (α_l) of deterministic elements of G and a sequence (λ_k) of probability laws on G such that, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{k,l} * \delta_{\alpha_l} \rightarrow \lambda_k$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$. This shows **(I1)**.

It is obvious that (λ_k) satisfies the convolution equation (4.7). Hence, by Lemma 4.3, there exists a solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ such that, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, it holds that η_k^0 has law λ_k and that

$$\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l \xrightarrow{d} \eta_k^0 \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (5.1)$$

Set $\tilde{\xi}_k = \alpha_{k+1}^{-1} \xi_k \alpha_k$ for $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. Then we see, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, that

$$\tilde{\xi}_{k,l} \xrightarrow{d} \alpha_{k+1}^{-1} \eta_k^0 \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (5.2)$$

Then Theorem 5.2 shows that there exists a compact subgroup H of G such that

- (i) $\eta_k^0 h \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_k^0$ for each $h \in H$ and each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;
- (ii) $\tilde{\xi}_{k,l} H$ converges a.s. in G/H as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$;
- (iii) $\alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}^0 \xrightarrow{d} \omega_H$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$.

The statement (ii) implies

- (ii') $\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l H$ converges a.s. in G/H as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$.

The statements (iii), (i) and (ii') prove **(I2)**, **(I3)** and **(I4)**, respectively.

Suppose that $(\tilde{\lambda}_k)$, $(\tilde{\alpha}_k)$ and $\tilde{H}$ also satisfy **(I1)** and **(I2)** and let g be an accumulation point such that $\alpha_l^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_l \rightarrow g$ along a subsequence $l = l(j)$.

By **(I1)**, we have $\mu_{k,l} * \delta_{\alpha_l} \rightarrow \lambda_k$ and $\mu_{k,l} * \delta_{\tilde{\alpha}_l} \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}_k$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. Taking the limit in both sides of the identity

$$\mu_{k,l} * \delta_{\tilde{\alpha}_l} = \mu_{k,l} * \delta_{\alpha_l} * \delta_{\alpha_l^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_l} \quad (5.3)$$

along the subsequence $l = l(j)$, we have $\tilde{\lambda}_k = \lambda_k * \delta_g$ for all $k \in -\mathbb{N}$.

By **(I2)**, we have $\delta_{\alpha_l^{-1}} * \lambda_{l-1} \rightarrow \omega_H$ and $\delta_{\tilde{\alpha}_l^{-1}} * \tilde{\lambda}_{l-1} \rightarrow \omega_{\tilde{H}}$ as $l \rightarrow -\infty$. Taking the limit in both sides of the identity

$$\delta_{\tilde{\alpha}_l^{-1}} * \tilde{\lambda}_{l-1} = \delta_{(\alpha_l^{-1} \tilde{\alpha}_l)^{-1}} * \delta_{\alpha_l^{-1}} * \lambda_{l-1} * \delta_g \quad (5.4)$$

along the subsequence $l = l(j)$, we obtain $\omega_{\tilde{H}} = \delta_{g^{-1}} * \omega_H * \delta_g$, which proves that $\tilde{H} = g^{-1}Hg$. Therefore the proof of Theorem 2.1 is complete. $\square$

Let us prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. (i) Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ be a solution satisfying **(E1)** with some $(\alpha_l) \subset G$. Let us prove that the solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is extremal.

Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be an arbitrary solution. Here we denote the noise process by the same notation without any confusion. Note that

$$\eta_k = \xi_{k,l} \eta_{l-1} = (\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l) (\alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}). \quad (5.5)$$

Since $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is compact, there exists a subsequence $l = l(j)$ such that

$$\alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1} \xrightarrow{d} V \quad \text{along } l = l(j) \quad (5.6)$$

for some G -valued random variable V , which we may take to be independent of $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$.

Now we take the limit in (5.5) along the subsequence $l = l(j)$. Note that, since $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ is a solution, we see that $\alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}$ is independent of $\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l$. By (5.1) and (5.6), we see that

$$(\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l, \alpha_l^{-1} \eta_{l-1}) \xrightarrow{d} (\eta_k^0, V) \quad \text{along } l = l(j). \quad (5.7)$$

Taking the limit in (5.5) along this subsequence, we have $\eta_k \stackrel{d}{=} \eta_k^0 V$ for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 4.3, we have $(\eta_k) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0 V)$. This proves that the solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is extremal.

(ii) Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ be a solution which satisfies **(E1)**, **(E3)** and **(E4)** for some sequence $(\alpha_l) \subset G$ and some compact subgroup H of G . Applying Theorem 5.2 to $\tilde{\xi}_k = \alpha_{k+1}^{-1} \xi_k \alpha_k$, we see that **(E2)** holds with these (α_l) and H .

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is therefore complete. $\square$

5.3 Construction of an extremal solution

Let us prove Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Let ξ_k 's be independent random variables such that each ξ_k has law μ_k . Let U_0 be a G -valued random variable which is independent of (ξ_k) and is uniform on H .

By Theorem 2.1, we see that, for any $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, the limit

$$\Phi_k := \lim_{l \rightarrow -\infty} \xi_{k,l} \alpha_l H \quad (5.8)$$

converges in G/H a.s. as $l \rightarrow -\infty$. Hence, for any fixed $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, we may define ϕ_k as $\phi_k = \mathbf{s}(\Phi_k)$. It is by definition that ϕ_k is a.s. measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ and that

$$\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l H \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \phi_k H \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (5.9)$$

Now it is obvious that

$$\phi_k H = \xi_k \phi_{k-1} H \quad \text{a.s. for all } k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (5.10)$$

For $k \in -\mathbb{N}$, we define

$$U_k = \phi_k^{-1} \xi_{0,k+1}^{-1} \phi_0 U_0. \quad (5.11)$$

Note that

$$h_k := \phi_k^{-1} \xi_{0,k+1}^{-1} \phi_0 = (\phi_k^{-1} \xi_{k+1}^{-1} \phi_{k+1}) (\phi_{k+1}^{-1} \xi_{k+2}^{-1} \phi_{k+2}) \cdots (\phi_{-1}^{-1} \xi_0^{-1} \phi_0), \quad (5.12)$$

which belongs to H a.s. by (5.10). Hence we see that

$$((\xi_k), U_k) = ((\xi_k), h_k U_0) \stackrel{d}{=} ((\xi_k), U_0); \quad (5.13)$$

in fact, since $h_k \in \mathcal{F}_0^\xi$, we have, for any bounded measurable function f on G ,

$$E[f(h_k U_0) | \mathcal{F}_0^\xi] = \int_H f(h_k h) \omega_H(dh) = \int_H f(h) \omega_H(dh) = E[f(U_0)]. \quad (5.14)$$

Now we see by (5.13) that U_k is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi$ and is uniform on H .

We define

$$\eta_k^0 = \phi_k U_k, \quad k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (5.15)$$

By (5.11), we have $\eta_k^0 = \xi_k \eta_{k-1}^0$ a.s. for each $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. Let us prove that each ξ_k is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{\eta^0}$. Let $k > l$ and let $f_k, f_{k-1}, \dots, f_l$ be non-negative measurable functions on G . Then we have

$$E[f_k(\xi_k) f_{k-1}(\eta_{k-1}^0) f_{k-2}(\eta_{k-2}^0) \cdots f_l(\eta_l^0)] \quad (5.16)$$

$$= E[f_k(\xi_k) f_{k-1}(\eta_{k-1}^0) f_{k-2}((\xi_{k-1,k-1})^{-1} \eta_{k-1}^0) \cdots f_l((\xi_{k-1,l+1})^{-1} \eta_{k-1}^0)] \quad (5.17)$$

$$= E[f_k(\xi_k) f_{k-1}(\phi_{k-1} U_{k-1}) f_{k-2}(\psi_{k-1} U_{k-1}) \cdots f_l(\psi_{l+1} U_{k-1})] \quad (5.18)$$

where $\psi_j = (\xi_{k-1,j})^{-1}\phi_{k-1}$ for $j = k-1, \dots, l+1$. By (5.13), we obtain

$$(5.18) = E[f_k(\xi_k)f_{k-1}(\phi_{k-1}U_0)f_{k-2}(\psi_{k-1}U_0) \cdots f_l(\psi_{l+1}U_0)]. \quad (5.19)$$

Since ξ_k is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}^\xi \vee \sigma(U_0)$, we obtain

$$(5.19) = E[f_k(\xi_k)]E[f_{k-1}(\phi_{k-1}U_0)f_{k-2}(\psi_{k-1}U_0) \cdots f_l(\psi_{l+1}U_0)]. \quad (5.20)$$

This proves that ξ_k is independent of $\sigma(\eta_{k-1}^0, \dots, \eta_l^0)$, and hence of $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}^{\eta^0}$ by a monotone class argument. Therefore, we see that $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is a solution.

Let $k \in -\mathbb{N}$. By (5.9), we have

$$\xi_{k,l}\alpha_l H \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta_k^0 H \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (5.21)$$

By (5.21) and by definition $\eta_k^0 = \phi_k U_k$, we have

$$\xi_{k,l}\alpha_l U_k \xrightarrow{\text{d}} \eta_k^0 U_k \stackrel{\text{d}}{=} \eta_k^0 \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty. \quad (5.22)$$

On the other hand, by **(I1)**, we see that the law of $\xi_{k,l}\alpha_l U_k$ converges to $\lambda_k * \omega_H$, which is equal to λ_k by **(I3)**. Thus we conclude that η_k^0 has law λ_k .

By (i) of Theorem 2.4, we see that the solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is extremal. The proof of Theorem 2.7 is therefore complete. $\square$

5.4 Characterization of extremal solutions

Now we prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$, (α_l) and H be as are given in the proof of Theorem 2.1. By (i) of Theorem 2.4, we see that $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is an extremal solution satisfying **(E1)**, **(E2)** and **(E3)** with (α_l) and H . We see by Theorem 2.7 that $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ also satisfies **(E4)**. Hence we see that this particular extremal solution $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ satisfies **(E1)**-**(E4)**. Since the general case follows immediately by Theorem 4.8, we have now proved the former half of Theorem 2.2. The latter half of Theorem 2.2 is immediate from that of Theorem 2.1. The proof of 2.2 is therefore complete. $\square$

5.5 Characterization of H_μ

Let us prove Corollary 2.5. Before doing this, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *Let H and K be compact subgroups of G . Let $g, g_1, g_2, \dots$ be elements of G . Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *If $H \subset K$ and if $g_n H \rightarrow gH$, then $g_n K \rightarrow gK$;*
- (ii) *If $g_n H \rightarrow gH$ and if $g_n K \rightarrow gK$, then $g_n(H \cap K) \rightarrow g(H \cap K)$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.3. (i) Let π_H and π_K denote the natural projections of G onto G/H and G/K , respectively. Since $H \subset K$, there exists a mapping $\pi_{H,K} : G/H \rightarrow G/K$ such that $\pi_K = \pi_{H,K} \circ \pi_H$. Then it is immediate that $\pi_{H,K}$ is continuous. Hence we see that $gK = \pi_{H,K}(gH) = \lim_n \pi_{H,K}(g_n H) = \lim_n g_n K$.

(ii) Let $\tilde{g}(H \cap K)$ be an accumulation point of $\{g_n(H \cap K)\}$, which exists by compactness of $G/(H \cap K)$. We may take a subsequence $n = n(j)$ such that $g_{n(j)}(H \cap K) \rightarrow \tilde{g}(H \cap K)$. By (i), we see that $g_{n(j)}H \rightarrow \tilde{g}H$ and $g_{n(j)}K \rightarrow \tilde{g}K$, which implies that $\tilde{g}H = gH$ and $\tilde{g}K = gK$. This shows that $\tilde{g}(H \cap K) = g(H \cap K)$. Thus we obtain $g_n(H \cap K) \rightarrow g(H \cap K)$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.5. (i) Set $H = \{h \in G : (\eta_k^0 h) \stackrel{d}{=} (\eta_k^0)\}$. Then it is obvious that H is a compact subgroup of G and contains H_μ . Then it is obvious that **(E3)** holds with H . By (i) of Lemma 5.3, we see that **(E4)** holds with (α_l) and H . Then, by (ii) of Theorem 2.4, it also satisfies **(E2)** with (α_l) and H . This proves that $H = H_\mu$.

(ii) Suppose that H is a compact subgroup such that

$$\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l H \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta_k^0 H \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty \text{ for all } k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (5.23)$$

Set $\tilde{H} = H \cap H_\mu$. By (ii) of Lemma 5.3, we see that

$$\xi_{k,l} \alpha_l \tilde{H} \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \eta_k^0 \tilde{H} \quad \text{as } l \rightarrow -\infty \text{ for all } k \in -\mathbb{N}. \quad (5.24)$$

Hence **(E3)** and **(E4)** hold with (α_l) and $\tilde{H}$. In the same way as above, we obtain $\tilde{H} = H_\mu$, which implies that $H \supset H_\mu$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 2.6. This is obvious from Theorem 2.2, Corollary 2.5 and Theorem 4.8. $\square$

5.6 Complementation formulae

In this section, we let (λ_k) , (α_l) and H be as in Theorem 2.1 and let $\mathbf{s}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{h}(\cdot)$ as in Subsection 2.4. For $g \in G$, we write $\mathbf{s}(g)$ simply for $\mathbf{s}(gH)$.

Now we prove Theorem 2.8.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Let $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ be any solution. Let U_0 be a G -valued random variable which is independent of $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\}$ and define (U_k) and (η_k^0) as given in Theorem 2.7. Since $\{(\eta_k^0), (\xi_k)\}$ is an extremal solution, there exists a G -valued random variable V such that $\{(\eta_k), (\xi_k)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{(\eta_k^0 V), (\xi_k)\}$. Noting that

$$\eta_k^0 V = \xi_{0,k+1}^{-1} \phi_0 U_0 \mathbf{h}(V^{-1})^{-1} \mathbf{s}(V^{-1})^{-1}, \quad (5.25)$$

and that U_0 is independent of $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi \vee \sigma(V)$, we have

$$\{(\eta_k^0 V), (\xi_k)\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{(\eta_k^0 \mathbf{s}(V^{-1})^{-1}), (\xi_k)\}. \quad (5.26)$$

Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $V = \mathbf{s}(V^{-1})^{-1}$. For simplicity, let us write

$$\eta_k = \eta_k^0 V = \phi_k U_k V. \quad (5.27)$$

Now it is obvious that Claims (i) and (ii) hold and that the three σ -fields $\sigma(U_k)$, $\sigma(V)$ and $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ are independent.

Let $k \in -\mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Since $\eta_k = \phi_k U_k V$, we have $\eta_k^{-1} \phi_k = V^{-1} U_k$. This shows that

$$V^{-1} = \mathbf{s}(V^{-1}) = \mathbf{s}(\eta_k^{-1} \phi_k). \quad (5.28)$$

Since k is arbitrary, we obtain (2.22) and $\sigma(V) \subset \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta$. By (5.27), we obtain (2.24).

By Lemma 3.3, we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^\eta = \bigcap_{k \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_k^\eta \subset \bigcap_{k \in -\mathbb{N}} \left(\mathcal{F}_k^{\eta^0} \vee \sigma(V) \right) = \left(\bigcap_{k \in -\mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_k^{\eta^0} \right) \vee \sigma(V) = \sigma(V) \quad (5.29)$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{\eta^0}$ is trivial. Thus we obtain Claim (iii).

Therefore the proof is complete. $\square$

5.7 Characteristic subgroups H_μ^{iso} and H_μ^{strong}

Now we prove Theorem 4.11.

Proof of Theorem 4.11. (i) This is obvious by (i) of Corollary 2.5.

(ii) Let us simply write H for H_μ . Set $N_H = \bigcup_{g \in G} gHg^{-1}$. Since G and H are compact, we see that N_H is also compact. In fact, if $g_n h_n g_n^{-1} \rightarrow f \in G$, then there exists a subsequence $n(m)$ such that $g_{n(m)} \rightarrow g \in G$ and $h_{n(m)} \rightarrow h \in H$, and hence $f = ghg^{-1} \in N_H$.

Let us prove that $H_\mu^{\text{strong}} = N_H$.

Let $k \in -\mathbb{N}$ be fixed. By the proof of Theorem 2.2, we may represent η_k^0 as $\eta_k^0 = \phi_k U_k$ where ϕ_k is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_k^\xi$ and U_k is independent of (ξ_k) and is uniform on H . Then, for any $\rho \in \mathfrak{H}_\mu^{\text{strong}}$, we have

$$\rho(U_k) = \rho(\phi_k)^{-1} \rho(\phi_k U_k) = \rho(\phi_k)^{-1} \rho(\eta_k^0) \in \mathcal{F}_k^\xi \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.30)$$

But, since $\rho(U_k)$ is independent of (ξ_k) , we see that $\rho(U_k)$ is constant a.s. That is, $\rho(h)$ is constant for ω_H -a.e. h . By continuity of ρ , we have $\rho = \text{id.}$ on H , which implies that $\rho = \text{id.}$ on N_H . Now we obtain

$$\mathfrak{H}_\mu^{\text{strong}} = \{ \rho : \rho(h) = \text{id. for every } h \in N_H \} \quad (5.31)$$

$$= \{ \rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2) : \rho_1 = \text{id. of } N_H, \rho_2 \text{ is unitary repre. on } G/N_H \}. \quad (5.32)$$

Since N_H is a compact normal subgroup, the quotient G/N_H is again a compact group. Hence the stabilizer H_μ^{strong} of $\mathfrak{H}_\mu^{\text{strong}}$ is nothing else but N_H .

The proof of Theorem 4.11 is therefore complete. $\square$

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Professors Marc Yor and Jean-Paul Thouvenot for their fruitful comments.

References

- [1] J. Akahori, C. Uenishi, and K. Yano. Stochastic equations on compact groups in discrete negative time. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 140(3-4):569–593, 2008.
- [2] P. Berti, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Trivial intersection of σ -fields and Gibbs sampling. *Ann. Probab.*, 36(6):2215–2234, 2008.
- [3] L. Chaumont and M. Yor. *Exercises in probability*, volume 13 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. A guided tour from measure theory to random processes, via conditioning.
- [4] B. S. Cirel'son. An example of a stochastic differential equation that has no strong solution. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 20:416–418, 1975; translated from Russian original: *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 20(2):427–430, 1975.
- [5] D. L. Cohn. *Measure theory*. Birkhäuser Boston, Mass., 1980.
- [6] I. Crimaldi, G. Letta, and L. Pratelli. Sur l'interversion de l'ordre entre deux opérations sur les tribus. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 345(6):341–344, 2007.
- [7] I. Csiszár. On infinite products of random elements and infinite convolutions of probability distributions on locally compact groups. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 5:279–295, 1966.
- [8] U. Grenander. *Probabilities on algebraic structures*. Second edition. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1968.
- [9] H. Heyer. *Probability measures on locally compact groups*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 94*.
- [10] N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, volume 24 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1989.
- [11] Y. Kawada and K. Itô. On the probability distribution on a compact group. I. *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan (3)*, 22:977–998, 1940.
- [12] B. M. Kloss. Probability distributions on bicomact topological groups. *Theor. Probability Appl.*, 4:237–270, 1959.

- [13] A. Mukherjea and N. A. Tserpes. *Measures on topological semigroups: convolution products and random walks*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 547. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
- [14] K. R. Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2005. Reprint of the 1967 original.
- [15] R. R. Phelps. *Lectures on Choquet's theorem*, volume 1757 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2001.
- [16] Y. Takahashi. Time evolution with and without remote past. *Proc. ICDEA 2006*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 53:347–362, 2009.
- [17] A. Tortrat. Lois tendues, convergence en probabilité et équation $P * P' = P$. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 258:3813–3816, 1964.
- [18] K. Yano and Y. Takahashi. Time evolution with and without remote past. *Sūrikaiseikikenkyūsho Kōkyūroku*, 1552:164–171, 2007. Recent Developments in Dynamical Systems (Kyoto, 2006).
- [19] K. Yano and M. Yor. Around Tsirelson's equation, or: The evolution process may not explain everything. submitted, 2009.
- [20] M. Yor. Tsirel'son's equation in discrete time. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 91(2):135–152, 1992.